1-1-2004

Social Worker or Cop? Measuring the Supervision Styles of Probation & Parole Officers in Kentucky and Missouri

Angela D. Crews
Marshall University, crewsa@marshall.edu

Richard P. Seiter

Recommended Citation
West, A. D., & Seiter, R. P. (2004). Social worker or cop? Measuring the supervision styles of probation & parole officers in Kentucky and Missouri. Journal of Crime and Justice, 27(2), 27-57.

Social Worker or Cop? Measuring the Supervision Styles of Probation & Parole Officers in Kentucky and Missouri

Angela D. West, Ph.D.
University of Louisville
Department of Justice Administration
Brigman Hall 2nd Floor
Louisville, KY 40292
(502) 852-0377
fax: (502) 852-0065
email: adwest01@louisville.edu

&

Richard P. Seiter, Ph.D.
St. Louis University
Sociology and Criminal Justice
Shannon Hall 114
St. Louis, MO 63103
(314) 977-2900

West, A.D. & Seiter, R.P. (2004). Social worker or cop? Measuring the supervision styles of probation and parole officers in Kentucky and Missouri. *Journal of Crime and Justice, 27*(2), 27-57.

Abstract

This study surveyed probation and parole officers in Missouri and Kentucky to determine their supervision styles along a “casework to surveillance” continuum. These self-ratings were correlated with officer self-reports of how they spend their time on the job engaged in various casework or surveillance activities. Additionally, volunteering officers were interviewed to provide clarification on their perceptions regarding the distinctions between a casework approach and a surveillance approach. Results indicate that officers spend more of their time engaged in casework activities, but perceive themselves as more surveillance oriented. Style varied significantly by sex of officer, with female officers spending significantly more time than male officers engaged in casework activities. Caseload size and type were related to style, as well. Interviews indicated that officers believe a surveillance style as necessary for community protection, but recognize the need for a balanced approach. This study has provided a way to quantify supervision styles and can be used to conduct future investigations about the impact of supervision style on client outcomes (i.e., successful reintegration or recidivism).

KEYWORDS: probation and parole, community corrections, correctional supervision, supervision styles

Introduction

When incarcerated individuals are released, most are placed in their communities under supervision by a community correctional officer (i.e., probation & parole officer) (Glaze, 2003). The supervision of these individuals is crucial to their success on the outside given that the officers who supervise them have significant control over whether they remain in their communities or return to incarceration. This seems to be an area that deserves serious investigation, given the likely relationship between incarceration (and re-incarceration) and being under supervision. However, issues and individuals within institutional environments receive most of the research attention and resources. Given that the community success of nearly 5 million people depends, in part, on the job performance of probation and parole officers, it is surprising that more attention has not been devoted to this area.

Over 6.7 million people were under correctional supervision in the United States as of yearend 2002 (Glaze, 2003). Of those, 70% were on probation or parole and 30% were incarcerated in jail or prison. The bulk of offenders (59%) under community supervision were on probation. Both probation and parole populations grew during 2002; the probation population grew by 1.6% during 2002, over half its average annual rate of growth between 1995 and 2001 and the parole population grew by 2.8%, nearly doubling its average annual growth between 1995 and 2001.

Although the number of adults under parole supervision remained fairly stable between 1992 and 2001(Hughes, Wilson, & Beck, 2001), the rather dramatic increase during 2002 may be due to changes in type of parole release. By yearend 2000 (the latest year for which data are available), 16 states had abolished parole board authority to

discretionarily release inmates from prison, and another 4 states had abolished discretionary parole for certain violent offenders. As a result, discretionary parole releases as a proportion of all parole releases dropped from 50% in 1995 to 39% in 2002 (Glaze, 2003; Hughes, Wilson & Beck, 2001), while the proportion that are mandatory (determined by statute) increased from 29% in 1990 to 52% in 2002 (Glaze, 2003; Hughes, Wilson & Beck, 2001)). Releases due to expiration of sentence comprise about 18% of all releases (Hughes, Wilson, & Beck, 2001).

The change in predominant type of release partially can be credited to the Federal "truth-in-sentencing" standard that requires Part I violent offenders to serve at least 85% of their prison sentence before being eligible for release. By yearend 2000, 29 states and Washington, D.C. had adopted this standard (Hughes, Wilson, & Beck, 2001).

The manner in which a parolee or probationer was supervised was recognized as important forty years ago. In the classic review of prisons and parole, Glaser (1964), noted, "The principal functions of parole supervision have been procurement of information on the parolee… and facilitating and graduating the transition between imprisonment and complete freedom…these functions presumably are oriented to the goals of protecting the public and rehabilitating the offender" (p. 423). Alberty (1969) analyzed the comparison between styles of parole supervision and violation rates, and defined supervision as "the means used to accomplish the goals of protecting society and rehabilitating the offender" (p. 3).

Since then, there has been three decades of study of the relationship between parole and probation officers and the offenders they supervise. In a 1972 study, Studt (1972) identified the critical role played by the individual supervision by parole agents in

achieving parole success. Even then, the author identified the two parole functions of surveillance and assistance to the parolee as a challenge in the interpersonal relationship between agent and offender. A decade later, Clear & O'Leary (1983) reviewed the introduction of risk assessment into community supervision, and described how using a structured assessment of risk based on standardized statistical instruments helps create the officers' work routines for each offender's supervision. These authors also described how such assessments should create clear supervisory goals for each offender at the outset of supervision (O'Leary & Clear, 1984).

More recently, the role conflict of supervision attitudes between control and assistance was emphasized in a review of intensive probation in Georgia and Ohio (Clear & Latessa, 1993). The authors noted how the probation agencies were apparently able to impact the tasks performed by officers through the organizational philosophy. If the agency wanted control, officers had more of an authority attitude, while if the agency wanted casework, officers' attitudes reflected more emphasis on assistance. Over the past several years, the role of probation and parole officers has more clearly been defined into either a "casework" or a "surveillance" approach. A casework style of supervision is said to place emphasis on assisting the offender with problems, counseling, and working to make sure the offender successfully completes supervision. Historically and almost exclusively until the late 1960s, probation and parole supervision was focused on restoring offenders to the community (Rothman, 1980).

Over the past two decades, however, the trend has been an increasing reliance on close surveillance to catch offenders when they fail to meet all required conditions. This style places an emphasis on monitoring and enforcing compliance with the rules of

supervision and on the detection of violations leading to revocations and returns to custody. Rhine (1997) described this change in supervision style as a "marked devaluation of traditional probation and parole supervision," and a "discernible shift toward risk management and surveillance" (p. 72). This shift has resulted in the development of a containment approach to supervise sex offenders (English, 1998), creating specific strategies to target gang members and other high-risk offenders in the community (Barajas, 2000), using GPS systems to track offenders (Johnson, 2002), and forming partnerships with police to conduct supervision (Burell, 1999; Leitenberger, Semenyna, & Spelman, 2003).

This shift may have less to do with philosophy than with pragmatics. Petersilia (2000) reports caseloads of 45 parolees in the 1970s, but that caseloads of 70 or more are common today. Probation caseloads in California, for example, increased so dramatically in the early 1990s that caseloads reached 500 per officer, and "some 60 percent of Los Angeles probationers were tracked solely by computer and had no face-to-face contact with a probation officer" (Beto, Corbett, & DiIulio, 2000, p. 3). With caseloads this size, there is no time to focus on the offender as an individual and attempt to provide counseling or referral to community agencies. Instead, officers can do little but concentrate on surveillance. Officers have little choice but to impersonally monitor the offenders.

Burton (1992) argues that the roles and responsibilities of probation and parole officers have not been clearly defined. Two goals, however, are or should be central to an officer's mission and objectives: 1) to rehabilitate treatable offenders; and 2) to protect society from at-risk individuals. These objectives, however, conflict and the conflicts are

compounded by the lack of clearly defined roles and responsibilities for the officers (Burton, 1992). Along with a lack of information about the supervision styles of probation and paroles officers, there is little understanding of the factors that impact supervision styles. It is unclear whether officers acquire their styles from personal philosophies, agency policies, supervisors, political rhetoric, stated agency missions, court and judicial oversights, or from geographic locations. Burke (2001) suggests that courts play a significant role in monitoring and sanctioning the parole population. There is significant support for synthesizing the structure and rigidity of surveillance supervision with the social work, "helping hand" approach of traditional, rehabilitation-oriented parole supervision (Burton, 1992; Clear & Cole, 1997; Fulton et al., 1997; Petersilia, 2001; Rhine, 1997). In essence, these authors suggest an integration of casework and surveillance methods.

One major concern related to parole supervision, in particular, is the failure of parolees to meet the conditions of community supervision. In 2002, for example, 55% of parolees discharged from supervision failed to meet the conditions and were returned to incarceration. Nearly one-third of those who were returned had violated the conditions of their supervision, with only 11% returned for committing new crimes (Glaze, 2003). These figures are mirrored in a study of recidivism that tracked 272,111 ex-offenders for 3 years after their release from prison in 1994. Langan and Levin (2002) found that nearly 52% of releasees went back to prison because of technical violations or new prison sentences.

Revocations are a serious concern. The proportion of individuals incarcerated as the result of a revocation rose from 17% in 1974 to 45% in 1991 (Cohen, 1995).

Currently, about 38% of all sentences to probation and 55% of all paroles are revoked (Glaze, 2003). Although there may be many reasons for increasing revocation rates, it is likely that the transition away from casework styles toward more surveillance styles has played a significant role.

Recidivism is a crucial measure of correctional success, especially if success is measured by the prevention of re-incarceration. Fulton et al., (1997) suggest that the surveillance method may not be effective in reducing recidivism. These authors advocate an integration of social worker and law enforcer to provide the best results for the offender, the officer, and society. However, huge caseloads may preclude the use of a casework style.

Probation and parole are difficult to understand without understanding the meaning and composition of their individual components. Contemporary writers regarding probation and parole have described roles, funding, training, approach, mission, organizational and bureaucratic philosophies of probation and parole policy makers and agencies, public opinion/society, and research. Throughout these missives, authors stress the need for "a new narrative" (Rhine, 1997).

While much has been written regarding the sometimes-competing roles of probation and parole officers, there has been little work to quantify the actual tasks they perform, and to categorize and quantify them into casework and surveillance activities. There is also a need for scholarly research that examines styles of probation and parole supervision and the effects of style on recidivism. The first step in attaining this goal is to identify and quantify styles of supervision on a continuum from casework to surveillance. This article details the results of such a study that aimed to identify the key

functions of parole and probation officers by asking officers to report self- and peer-ratings on a "casework to surveillance" continuum. Finally, this project establishes an instrument that can be used to create base line information regarding how probation and parole officers spend their time, and whether the functions officers perform are casework, surveillance, or a balance of the two.

Research Design

To date, there has been no way to identify the style of supervision performed by probation and parole officers. The objective of this study is to create an instrument to measure the style of supervision provided by probation and parole officers. This is valuable, as it provides an opportunity to examine correlations of supervision style with a variety of other data, functions, or activities, and attempt to determine how style influences success on parole or probation, or how it impacts revocation or recidivism rates.

Setting

The study was conducted in the Eastern Probation and Parole Region (St. Louis) of the Missouri Department of Corrections (MDOC), and in four district offices of the Louisville region within the Kentucky Department of Corrections (KDOC). These departments supervise probationers sentenced from their respective court systems, and parolees being returned from Missouri and Kentucky prisons.

Research Questions

This project addressed several research questions. Some of these questions were best approached with a quantitative research design (survey), while others required a qualitative method (interviews). This use of multiple methods strengthened the validity of the findings in that results from the surveys were clarified through the interviews.

Research questions addressed quantitatively include the following:

1. On what types of activities do officers typically spend their time on the job? Are these activities primarily casework or surveillance?

2. Is there a relationship between how officers perceive their supervision styles and the activities in which they actually spend their time?

3. What factors (e.g., caseload, time on the job, type of caseload) are related to an officer's perceived style of supervision?

4. What factors are related to the types of activities in which officers spend their time?

Research questions addressed qualitatively include the following:

1. How do officers view the relationship between supervision style and recidivism or successful completion of probation or parole?

2. How do officers define their primary roles?

3. How do officers feel about the distinction between casework and surveillance activities?

4. What types of activities and programs do officers think are most important to an offender's success on supervision?

Survey Construction

Activities performed by probation and parole officers were identified and included within a more comprehensive questionnaire designed to measure the variables of interest as defined in the research questions. An interview schedule also was constructed to supplement and clarify the survey (see following section). Sample survey and interview schedules were shared with probation and parole administrators, who suggested revisions to clarify questions and make them more representative of the functions of probation and parole officers. These administrators also critiqued and suggested revisions to the list of activities. The revised list includes the following activities or functions:

Making a home visit to check on offenders.
Making a visit to the offenders' place of employment to check on them.
Seeing offenders in your office for the following activities:

- Conducting assessments of offenders (such as risk, need, the interview/assessment worksheet, etc.)
- Counseling offenders on areas of need (not including general failure to follow conditions of supervision)
- Conducting drug testing (taking a urine sample, checking on results, etc.)
- Explaining or reinforcing the rules of supervision to offenders.

Writing violation reports.
Appearing in court.
Finding or directing offenders to programs (such as educational or vocational training, substance abuse, employment assistance, etc.)
Writing reports to recommend early discharge from supervision.
Conducting detention interviews/preliminary hearing.
Running offender groups.
Conducting follow-up activities with community treatment resources to assess offender participation.
Having contact with offenders' significant others.
Having contact with offenders' victims.
Other activities (**Please specify**) _____
Other activities (**Please specify**) _____

The second step was to validate the list of activities and to classify them as either "casework" or "surveillance" activities. This was accomplished by using a modified Delphi method. The list of activities, along with the following definitions of "casework" and "surveillance," was provided to about 30 probation and parole experts around the country.

Casework supervision means an emphasis on assisting the offender with problems, counseling, and working to make sure the offender successfully completes supervision.

Surveillance supervision means an emphasis on monitoring and enforcing compliance with the rules of supervision and the detection of violations leading to revocation and return to custody.

While acknowledging that many of the listed activities can represent both casework and surveillance functions, these experts were asked to make a forced choice

and to categorize each activity into one of the two definitions. The responses of these experts were combined, and each task categorized as either casework or surveillance, according to majority rule.

The 30 experts rated the following activities as casework: 1) conducting assessments; 2) counseling offenders; 3) explaining/reinforcing rules; 4) finding/directing to programs; 5) writing reports to recommend early discharge; 6) running offender groups, and 7) conducting follow-up activities. The following activities were rated as surveillance: 1) making home visits; 2) making employment visits; 3) conducting drug testing; 4) conducting detention interviews; 5) having contact with offenders' significant others; 6) having contact with offenders' victims; 7) writing violation reports; and 8) appearing in court

Interviews

Officers who completed surveys were given the opportunity to volunteer for an interview. During these interviews, officers were asked to elaborate on issues raised during the survey, and to provide personal opinions related to their roles and responsibilities as officers. These interviews included asking about the importance of casework or surveillance activities, the conflicts between helping offenders and protecting society, and other qualitative aspects of probation and parole officers' duties. The interviews took between 45 minutes to one hour to complete, and were subsequently transcribed for analysis. Officer interviews were coded so that their identity would not be associated with their particular interview responses.

Data Collection Process

Surveys were conducted among state probation and parole officers in the Eastern

Probation and Parole Region of Missouri and in four district offices within the city of Louisville, Kentucky. Each officer (except administrators and officers who did not supervise offenders) in each office under study was asked to voluntarily participate. A total of 327 officers were given the opportunity to participate, resulting in the return of 142 surveys (41% response rate). The survey asked respondents to estimate the percent of time (to total 100%), on average, that they spent on each activity.

Officers were told to disregard any time they spend on areas such as training, travel, or personnel matters. They were asked only to consider the time they spent on activities that related to the supervision of offenders. The surveys included the above definition of casework and surveillance, but did not identify activities as either casework or surveillance. In addition to proportioning their time among the listed activities, officers also were asked to rate their own supervision style on a "casework to surveillance" continuum ranging from 1 (representing an absolute casework approach) to 10 (representing an absolute surveillance approach), as well as to estimate their peers' supervision styles on the same continuum.

For the interviews, a list of volunteers was compiled and 20 officers were randomly selected for participation. A total of 16 officers completed the interview process. Given that the goal of qualitative research is to obtain depth of information, rather than broadly generalizable information, a sample size of 16 is acceptable. Those 16 respondents are not meant to represent the opinions or preferences of all of the Missouri and Kentucky officers, but to give some insight that survey responses cannot provide. Copies of both the survey and the interview schedule are available upon request from the first author.

Data Management

After the surveys were collected and the interviews were completed, the quantitative data were entered into an SPSS data file and analyzed to address the research questions. The interview data were analyzed qualitatively by determining common themes and by categorizing responses to questions (see discussion of analysis below).

After the data were analyzed, results were interpreted and conclusions were reached about the research questions. Implications were considered and recommendations were made with respect to application of the findings. As a courtesy to the MDOC and to the KDOC, data were analyzed separately, by state, so that each department could determine the particular characteristics of its own officers. This paper reports only the aggregate data, derived from both state departments.

Analysis and Results

Separate discussions of the data analysis and results are provided for the survey data and for the interview data. Survey and interview participants are described descriptively, and inferential statistics are used to make conclusions regarding the research questions. The levels of measurement for some of the variables impacted the types of statistical analyses that could be completed. For example, the three main dependent variables are self-rating on the continuum, time spent in casework activities, and time spent in surveillance activities. Self-rating is measured at the ordinal level, so the most appropriate method involves nonparametric analyses. Moreover, preliminary analyses indicated that the distribution of this variable violated some of the assumptions required to use parametric procedures (e.g., homogeneity of variances). The tests actually used will be discussed in greater detail below.

Descriptive Analysis

Sample Demographics

Table 1 provides descriptions of the sample in terms of its demographic characteristics. The survey sample was predominately white (80%) and female (54%), with an average age of 34.5 years. All respondents had at least some college education, with about 3% having less than a bachelor's degree. Most degree holders majored either in criminal justice (50%) or in psychology (16%).

Job Demographics

Survey respondents had spent an average of about 5.5 years (median of about 3 years) on the job supervising an average of 66 clients representing a mix of probation and parole (94%) with caseload types evenly split between specialized (51%) and regular (48%). Missouri and Kentucky are both "combined" states, whereby the Department of Corrections oversees the administration of both probation and parole for all adult felons. Regular caseloads are a mix of offenders. Specialized caseloads are targeted to address the needs of a particular type of offender, to include- intensive supervision, sex offender, violent offender, mental health offender, or substance abuse offender caseloads. The range of number of supervised offenders is surprisingly wide; the smallest caseload was 8 offenders, while the largest was 275.

Insert Table 1 about here

Supervisory Activities

Respondents were given a list of 15 officer supervisory activities and asked to apportion their time between those activities to total 100% (not including time spent on administrative functions such as training, completing personnel paperwork, or discussing

their performance with their supervisors). Two "other" categories also were provided. Respondents indicated that their time was spent in their offices, counseling offenders on areas of need, not including general failure to follow conditions of supervision (15.4% of their time), followed by writing violation reports (13.3%), and conducting risk/needs assessments of offenders (11.1%). These three activities represented approximately 40% of the surveyed officers' time. The least amount of time spent was on working with offender groups (< 1%) and visiting offenders' places of employment (1.3%).

As previously mentioned, this list of 15 activities had been circulated around the country to various experts in probation and parole. These experts had been asked to classify each activity as either a "casework" activity or a "surveillance" activity. Using these classifications, it was then possible to determine on which type of activity an officer spent time, and in what proportion (it is noted that six officers did not make their time total 100%--three were less than 100% and three were more than 100%). As a whole, respondents spent an average of 54% of their time on casework and 42% of their time on surveillance activities. Table 2 provides a summary of these respondent and job characteristics.

In addition, some respondents indicated that they spent time engaged in "other activities." The officers' average time spent on "other" activities (about 12%) was skewed by three extremely high percentages. Three officers said they spent 85% or more of their time on "other" activities that they defined as surveillance, apprehension, and the preparation of pre-sentence reports and pre-parole supplemental investigations. This may indicate that these officers had specialized duties and did not deal directly with the supervision of offenders. Moreover, the "other" activities of surveillance and

apprehension obviously are surveillance-oriented activities that might have been better placed in an existing category (i.e., home or work visits). It is much more realistic to consider the median of 5% as the more accurate measure of how much time officers devote to other activities. Therefore, these "other" activities are not considered either casework or surveillance, but are reported separately and only discussed as they may relate to outcomes.

Insert Table 2 about here

Supervision Styles Continuum

Respondents, who were provided definitions of "casework" and "surveillance" supervision styles on their surveys, were asked to provide an estimate of their own supervision style and to estimate where their peers' supervision styles might fall along this same continuum. Rating options ranged from pure casework (1) to pure surveillance (10) as illustrated on the following diagram:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Total Casework									Total Surveillance

Thus, rankings from 1 to 5 represent more casework-oriented styles and rankings from 6-10 represent more surveillance-oriented styles.

As shown in Table 3, most respondents (about 22%) ranked themselves at 7 on the scale, while most (28%) ranked their peers at 5. This indicates that respondents viewed their own styles as more surveillance-oriented, but perceived their peers to have more casework-oriented styles.

Insert Table 3 about here

Inferential Analysis

In addition to the descriptive analyses detailed above, it was important to determine the relationships among the variables through several types of inferential analysis. The questions addressed with this type of analysis included the following:

1. What factors are related to the types of activities in which officers spend their time?

2. Is there a relationship between how officers perceive their supervision styles and the activities in which they spend their time?

3. What factors (e.g., caseload, time on the job, type of caseload) are related to an officer's perceived style of supervision?

Bivariate Correlations

As an initial step into the inferential analysis, bivariate correlations were conducted with the

variables of interest. Three variables were dummy coded for this process: 1) caseload type (0 = regular; 1 = specialized); 2) self-rating on the continuum (0 = continuum ratings from 1-5; 1 = continuum ratings from 6 - 10); and 3) peer-rating on the continuum (0 = continuum ratings from 1-5; 1 = continuum ratings from 6 – 10). Sex was originally dummy-coded (0 = male; 1 = female), and the remaining variables were interval level (time spent in surveillance activities, time spent in casework activities, age, time on the job in months, and caseload size).

Table 4 provides details of the relevant significant correlations. The dependent variables of concern were time spent in surveillance activities, time spent in casework activities, and self-rating on the continuum.

Insert Table 4 about here

Time spent in surveillance activities

The variables "time spent in casework activities" and "caseload type" were significantly correlated with time spent in surveillance activities. As officers spent less time in casework activities, they spent more time engaged in surveillance activities ($r = -.513$, $p < .00$). In addition, having a regular caseload was correlated with more time in surveillance activities ($r = -.189$, $p < .03$).

Time spent in casework activities

The variables "self-rating on the continuum," "sex," and "caseload size" were significantly correlated with time spent in casework activities. Being a female officer ($r = .22$, $p < .01$), having smaller caseloads ($r = -.279$, $p < .01$), and having "casework-oriented" self-ratings ($r = -.176$, $p < .04$) all were significantly correlated with spending more time on casework activities. Sex and caseload size also were strongly correlated with each other ($r = -.189$, $p < .025$); being female was associated with smaller caseloads. Therefore, it was possible that the significant correlation between sex and time spent in casework activities could be explained by caseload size. To investigate this possibility, partial correlations were examined between sex and time spent on casework activities, controlling for the impact of caseload size. The correlation between sex and time spent on casework activities was slightly mediated, but remained significant ($r = .178$, $p < .04$). This indicates that, despite caseload size, females still spent more time than males engaged in casework activities.

Self-rating on the continuum

Peer-rating on the continuum was the only variable significantly correlated with self-rating ($r = .298$, $p < .00$). Respondents tended to rate their peers as they did themselves. It is difficult to make an assumption, however, about the direction of this relationship. One possibility is that an officer develops his or her own style after observing the style of his or her peers. This type of modeling would then lead to the development of similar styles among the officers. On the other hand, officers could be estimating their peers' styles to be similar to their own. In either case, perceptions of peer- and self-style are fairly predictive of each other.

Comparing Mean Levels of Time Spent in Activities

T-tests for independent samples were conducted on the dependent variables that were measured at the interval level (time spent in surveillance activities, time spent in casework activities) to determine the likelihood that observed significant correlations translate into real differences between the populations. All statistical analyses were conducted using an alpha level of $p < .05$ as the requirement for statistical significance. Actual alpha levels are reported.

Given the significant correlation between caseload type and time spent in surveillance activities, further analysis was warranted to determine whether there are significant differences between officers who supervise regular caseloads and officers who supervise specialized caseloads in the average amount of time they spend on surveillance activities. A t-test for independent samples was conducted to determine whether the type of caseload officers supervise (regular or specialized) is related to the average amount of time spent on casework or surveillance activities.

As indicated in Table 5, there is no significant difference between officers who supervise regular and specialized caseloads in terms of the time they spend engaged in casework activities. The two groups do differ significantly, however, in terms of the time they spend on surveillance activities. Officers who supervise regular caseloads spend significantly more time on surveillance activities than officers who supervise specialized caseloads ($t = 2.266$ (138), $p < .03$). This is most likely because many of the specialized caseloads are treatment oriented, such as drug abuse and mental health, and result in the officers responsible for the caseload to take on more of a casework or "counseling" approach to supervision.

Insert Table 5 about here

Table 6 provides the results from t-tests conducted using time spent in casework activities as the dependent variable. The independent variables were "self-rating on the continuum," and "sex."

Casework oriented officers ($t = 2.11(140)$, $p. < .04$) and female officers ($t = -2.672(138)$, $p. < .01$) spend significantly more time than surveillance oriented and male officers engaged in casework activities. It is logical that casework oriented officers would spend more time on casework activities than surveillance oriented officers. The direction of this relationship, however, is again difficult to discern. It could be that officers are more likely to perceive themselves as casework oriented because they spend more time on casework activities. On the other hand, it could be that officers who spend more time on casework oriented activities are more likely to perceive themselves as casework oriented.

Insert Table 6 about here

The relationship between being female and engaging in more casework activities cannot be explained by size of caseload. It is difficult to explain this finding without making sexist assumptions about differences in the natures of men and women. Future research is necessary to more completely investigate this finding.

In addition to the t-tests, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine whether there were significant differences in the average amount of time spent on activities by how officer's perceived their own styles of supervision. Self-rating (from 1-10) was the independent variable in two ANOVA runs, with time spent in casework activities and time spent in surveillance activities as the two dependent variables. It would be logical to expect that an officer's view of his or her own supervision style would be reflected in the actual amount of time spent engaged in those types of activities. That is, one would expect officers who view themselves as more casework oriented would spend more time engaged in casework activities, whereas surveillance-oriented officers would spend more time engaged in surveillance activities.

Results of the ANOVA analyses are presented in Table 7. There was a significant difference between self-ratings and time spent in casework activities ($F = 3.144$, 141 df, $p < .01$), but not between self-ratings and time spent in surveillance activities. In particular, Tukey's HSD indicated that there were significant differences between officers who rated themselves as 10 on the continuum (having a pure surveillance style) and officers who rated themselves between 3 and 9 on the continuum. This is logical given that one

would not expect officers who rate their styles as purely surveillance to spend a great deal of time engaged in casework activities.

Insert Table 7 about here

Interestingly, there were no differences in time spent on surveillance activities by officer self-ratings. That is, officers who perceived themselves as more casework oriented (rating from 1-5) spent the same amount of time engaged in surveillance activities as officers who perceived themselves as more surveillance oriented (rating from 6-10). This may be because all officers must engage in a certain level of surveillance activity, regardless of their "natural" orientations.

In addition to these tests, a Jonckheere-Terpstra (J-T) test was conducted to determine whether self-rating on the continuum differed significantly by number of offenders supervised, time spent in casework activities, and time spent in surveillance activities. This test is similar to the Kruskal-Wallis test in that it tests whether respondents who rated themselves at the different levels had significantly different responses on the three independent variables, but is more powerful when the populations of interest (grouped by the different rankings) are at the ordinal level.

As indicated in Table 8, there is likely no difference between individuals who ranked themselves at different levels on the continuum in terms of the numbers of offenders on their caseloads, or in the average amount of time they spent on surveillance activities. There are significant differences among the rankings, however, in the average amount of time they spent on casework activities (J-T = -2.749 (142), $p. < .01$). As ranking increases (moves toward a surveillance orientation), time spent in casework

activities decreases. This makes sense in that one would expect officers who see themselves as more surveillance-oriented would spend less time engaged in casework activities.

Insert Table 8 about here

Individual Interview Analysis

The final question on the survey informed respondents that more extensive individual interviews were going to be held, that they would be voluntary, and asked if they would agree to be interviewed. In the Missouri group, no respondents indicated an unwillingness to be interviewed, and a random group of 20 was selected. Eleven interviews were actually conducted. Officers who specifically indicated a willingness to be interviewed were accommodated. In the Kentucky group, potential interviewees were asked to indicate their willingness to be interviewed by providing their name and contact information on a sign-up sheet. A list was compiled from those names and 10 participants were randomly selected. Out of these 10, five persons actually were interviewed.

The interview group was, in general, very similar to the surveyed group. Both groups had been on the job about 5 years. Most respondents majored in criminal justice while in college, and prior to or during their college educations, many claim to have been connected to the corrections field through volunteer work, internships, or training processes. Most of these officers became more interested in probation/parole after being exposed to the information through their degrees or job experience, and decided to proceed with this line of work.

Just as with the survey sample, interview respondents noted their principle job includes a combination of probation and parole functions. They work an average of about 40 hours per week, but this is somewhat misleading. The Kentucky officers were restricted to 37.5 hours per week, whereas the Missouri officers worked an average of about 42 hours per week. Approximately one-half of the officers replied that "paperwork" is the bulk of their workload, specifically writing violation and progress reports. One officer stated that "it is a lot of administrative work, and that end of our job has been increasing with increasing caseloads, decreasing officer numbers and decreasing the amount of time [given the 37.5 hour per week restriction]." Other officers reported that face-to-face contacts with offenders, court dates, supervision, and interviews took up most of their time.

Nine of the officers supervised a regular caseload, and seven supervised a specialized caseload. These specialized caseloads included mental health, drug offenders, psychiatric, intensive probation, and sex-offenders. The average number of offenders under supervision for regular cases was about 84 and for specialized cases the average was 62. Overall, the numbers of offenders that these officers had supervised over their careers ranged from a minimum of 5 to a maximum of 150. Respondents suggested that an ideal caseload was 50-60 offenders, to enable the officer to devote more time to each case. For supervision of mentally ill and psychiatric cases, the ideal caseload size was 35 to 45, and for sex offenders an ideal caseload was 20 to 25.

One officer who supervised approximately 150 offenders expressed his frustration with fulfilling the requirements of the job when his caseload was so large. When asked about an ideal caseload, he said that, "anything over 100, things start slipping by. You

start falling off a little bit on when you can do your reports because just keeping up with getting enough office visits, getting enough home visits in, getting record checks, writing reports and things."

The officers responded that the primary role of probation/ parole officers is to ensure public safety, to supervise and offer resources to help the client readjust to society, to prevent recidivism, steer the offenders in the right direction, to be a court reporter, monitor the offender, and to hold the offender highly accountable for his or her actions and responsibilities. A female officer in Kentucky stated that the primary role of a probation/parole officer is "two-fold…we've got two primary concerns. One is obviously the protection of the community and I think the other one is rehabilitation of a client…One is a law enforcement and one is social work and you have to kind of come to a nice mesh." These responses are particularly interesting, as they point out the wide range of responsibilities of officers, and the varying importance that officers put on these different roles.

Each officer found his or her offenders and caseloads to be unique. Therefore they handle them differently. Officers were asked if they thought it important for a probation and parole officer to develop more of a "casework" or a "surveillance" style of supervision. They were also asked what casework functions they thought are most important or most effective in assisting offenders, and what surveillance functions are most important or most effective in "catching" offenders who violate conditions of supervision or offenders likely to violate conditions. Officers who rated themselves as having more of a surveillance style felt that this was extremely important, especially in regard to those supervising sex-offenders. One officer explained his reasoning by stating

that “surveillance needs to be more than the casework because my philosophy is that the community protection outweighs the rehabilitation.” Other support for the surveillance function pertained to making sure the offenders had routine home visits, specifically to check on home placements and curfew compliance.

In the support of casework methods, several officers mentioned the need to help offenders stay out of prison, partly because of the high level of prison overcrowding. While these officers noted that the focus should be on keeping offenders out of prison instead of catching them in violations, they also emphasized the need to hold offenders accountable for digressions. A Kentucky officer, for example, stated, “I don’t think we are doing anybody a service if these guys come out and we don’t make an effort to provide them with necessary resources to facilitate some change. We just send them back where they came from and they’ll be back again with the same issues not having been addressed.”

The casework functions considered most important by respondents mostly deal with a “social work” type of oversight. Officers mentioned the need to make sure that offenders are matched with the most helpful services and are generally staying out of trouble. An underlying theme seemed to be that it was important to develop some type of relationship with the client. Issues of trust and reliability were mentioned. In explaining his position on this matter, one officer stated his “number one top priority is developing a rapport with the offender when they come in to gain some level of trust.” Another officer said that she tries to “read through a person’s entire file,” because she likes to understand who she is dealing with and their established patterns. This will help her to determine

whether she should "put more emphasis on trying to really encourage this person to hang in there."

Most officers felt that both casework and surveillance were equally important. For example, officers said that, "in this job, you pretty much have to try as hard as possible to split it down the middle," and that "it's important to have a balanced approach."

Respondents were asked how they determine which style of supervision to use. They also were asked what factors (e.g., management, type or size of caseload, etc.) played major roles in the determination of their personal styles. While most respondents mentioned that policies and procedures provided broad guidelines for what they could and could not do ("we can't beat the shit out of a client"), each one commented that the natures of both the offender and the offense generally dictate their style of supervision. Additionally, an officer's style develops as a result of the approach with which they feel most comfortable and productive. One officer explained his position by stating that:

> we have minimum standards for supervision, but once you get past those minimum standards, you just kind of adapt your style for each individual offender. There are some you have to deal with with kid gloves. A lot of our offenders have mental health issues and education levels are so different, and crime is so broadly distributed that you really have to treat each one as an individual.

Interview data indicate that officers have tremendous flexibility and autonomy when it comes to choosing style and activities that they feel best suit each offender. Interview data also indicate that officers believe a casework orientation to be most effective in the long term, but that caseload and paperwork requirements sometimes "force" them to adopt more surveillance-type activities to move offenders through the system.

Officers also were asked whether they thought that supervision style has anything to do with offender recidivism or the violation of probation/parole. Officers were evenly split in their beliefs that supervision has any impact on re-offending. Seven felt that the style of supervision does affect recidivism and nine felt that style was totally unrelated. Most officers felt that offenders are going to act as they want, unconnected to a certain supervision style ("if they're going to re-offend, they're going to re-offend").

Officers also were asked whether other factors, such as stress and burnout could influence supervision style. Respondents noted personal factors that influence style are the level of patience with particular offenders, ability to remain detached from clients, bringing personal issues to the job, overall personality, chances for an officer to be in a burn-out stage (usually because of age), officers becoming "lackadaisical" with clients, inexperience of younger officers and caseload size. A Kentucky officer echoed the sentiments of many when she said "when you can't sit across the desk with someone and can't talk with them without yelling and becoming so angry that you are ready to explode, I would think that has every impact because it seems personal." In fact, not taking the job personally was frequently mentioned. One fairly new officer mentioned going to court for revocation hearings and having the court not revoke; "I would go to court and they would not revoke and I would get so upset, but I would think, it's not personal. It has nothing to do with what I did or didn't do."

These officers are in daily contact with community programs and services that exist for the aid of the client under supervision. The nature, extent, and quality of these programs and services vary widely. When asked to describe those programs and services they thought were most beneficial in assisting released inmates in their re-entry process,

the overwhelming majority mentioned programs that address drug & alcohol treatment needs while providing a place for the releasee to live (i.e., halfway houses).

In Missouri, those specifically mentioned most often were the St. Louis Community Resource Center, the Dismas House (also mentioned in Louisville), and St. Patrick's (also mentioned in Louisville). In Louisville, officers mentioned (in addition to the two above), the Healing Place, Wayside Christian Mission, the Salvation Army, and Prodigal Ministries. Several of these are halfway houses designed to provide a transitional residence for released offenders.

Nearly all of the Louisville officers mentioned a program, thought to be through Prodigal Ministries, called Insight and Support. According to one officer, this program was designed specifically to assist releasees with the re-entry process. This program helps the releasees "readjust from being in a fully structured environment where someone is not there all the time to tell you 'lights out,' to tell you 'let's go eat now.' You have so much of a responsibility on your own to take care of yourself." However, one officer was not very impressed with any of the programs, calling them "rubber stamped by the courts" and "designed for first time offenders with very little criminal history." With respect to some programs, this officer complained that a 10 or 20 hour program would not "affect any type of behavior in terms of long term changes," and that the probation/parole system is "pretty much lining some pockets."

To conclude the interviews, respondents were asked a variety of questions regarding the future of probation and parole supervision. They were first asked to identify problems and possible solutions regarding the future of their agency in recruiting, hiring, and retaining talented and dedicated officers. Several officers

mentioned low pay and heavy caseloads as problems in attracting and retaining qualified personnel. Additionally, due to budgetary constraints, the Kentucky system is operating under a hiring freeze and a restriction on the number of hours per week they work. The lack of training also was mentioned as a concern. For example, one officer mentioned that she actually began her job and was issued a weapon before she was trained on the use of firearms. She said, "I did not know how to use a gun and I'm probably not the best shot. I say I could probably throw it at them better."

As for the future of supervision over the next ten years, most saw technology playing a crucial role in the supervision of offenders. Others believed that policy changes could impact probation and parole because of a shift toward a more social work orientation rather than a law enforcement orientation.

Summary

Probation and parole officers in Missouri and Kentucky were surveyed and interviewed in an attempt to better understand their supervisory roles and activities. The findings indicate an interesting level of conflict between how officers view their roles, how they view their peers, how they perceive they spend their time on the job, and how they actually spend their time on the job.

Officers, for example, estimated that they spent about 54% of their time engaged in what experts classify as casework activities, and 42% of their time engaged in surveillance activities. However, these same officers perceive themselves as more surveillance oriented on a 10 point continuum. Moreover, officers believed that a balanced supervisory style should be the goal, and that current caseloads may be forcing more of a surveillance approach, but future trends seem to be indicating a switch to more

casework oriented approaches. These factors all are related to caseloads and to the types of caseloads that officers are supervising.

Increased time spent in surveillance activities was related to decreased time in casework activities and to having a regular caseload. This may be because the regular caseloads were significantly larger than the specialized caseloads and larger caseloads do not lend themselves to a casework approach. To emphasize this, officers who had regular caseloads spent significantly more time engaged in surveillance activities than officers with specialized caseloads.

Increased time in casework activities was associated with being female, having smaller caseloads, and perceiving oneself to have a casework orientation. Increased time in casework also was associated with an officer's self-rating. Surveillance-oriented officers spent less time in casework. However, self-rating was not related to time spent in surveillance activities, suggesting that these types of activities may be mandated rather than the result of any particular surveillance of casework propensity of the officer.

The impact of sex is interesting and one that should be investigated with future research. It would be worthwhile to determine whether there is a corresponding impact on case outcome depending on the sex of the supervising officer (i.e., do offenders supervised by females have different revocation or re-offending rates than offenders supervised by males?).

Results from the interviews suggest that officers perceive a balanced approach is necessary in dealing with offenders. However, officers consistently emphasize the importance of community safety over offender needs. Moreover, it appears that officers equate community safety with more of a surveillance approach (watch releasees closely

to detect law violations and behaviors that may be potentially harmful to law-abiding citizens), rather than a casework approach.

While several officers commented on the need for offender rehabilitation, there is considerable variation in perceived ways to accomplish this goal, and in the degree to which probation/parole officers are involved in this process. For example, it is interesting that half of the interviewed officers believe that they have no role in a client's re-offending. This belief seems to imply that the officers view their jobs as mostly surveillance. This interpretation is supported by the survey findings.

Results from this project suggest many avenues for future investigations. For example, it would be worthwhile to have officers actually document the time they spend involved in various tasks during each day over a one-month period. This would help clarify the discrepancy between how officers rate themselves on the casework-surveillance continuum (in this case, primarily toward surveillance), and how they estimate they actually spend their time (in this case, primarily engaged in casework activities). In addition, the relationship between an officer's sex and how time is spent might provide interesting policy implications if it is determined that female officers, who spend more time in casework activities, actually have clients with lower rates of re-offending.

This research effort was designed as a preliminary study, to lay the groundwork for future investigation. This project has provided a way to quantify and define the supervision styles of probation and parole officers by developing an instrument to quantify these styles on a continuum between casework and surveillance. The next

logical step is to expand the identification of supervision styles to additional states, and to attempt to correlate supervision styles with client outcomes.

In summary, the supervision of probationers and parolees is a seldom examined, yet critically important part of the correctional system in the United States. Little is known about the activities of probation and parole officers, yet revocation rates continue to rise. This results in increasing numbers of prison admissions because of failure during community supervision. The often-cited transition from casework to surveillance styles of supervision deserves examination, and needs to be quantified and related to measures of outcome. This study is the first step in that process.

References

Alberty, P.T. (1969). A study of the relationship between styles of supervision and parole officer's violations rate. Unpublished Master's thesis. University of Missouri, Columbia.

Barajas, E. (2000). High risk offenders in the Community. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections.

Beto, D.R., Corbett, R.P., Jr., & DiIulio, J.J., Jr. (2000). Getting serious about probation and the crime problem. Corrections Management Quarterly, 4(2), 1-8.

Burke, P.B. (2001). Collaboration for successful prisoner reentry: The role of parole and the courts. Corrections Management Quarterly, 5(3), 11-22.

Burrell, W.D. (1999). Getting the most out of probation/parole-police partnerships. Community Corrections Report. 7(1), 1-12.

Burton, V.S. et.al. (1992). The role of probation officers: An examination of statutory requirements. Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice. 8(4), 273-282.

Clear, T. & Cole, G. (1997). American corrections. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Clear, T.R. & Latessa, E.J. (1993). Probation officers' roles in intensive supervision: Surveillance versus treatment. Justice Quarterly. 10(3), 441-462.

Clear T.R. & O'Leary, V. (1983). Controlling the offender in the community: Reforming the community- supervision function. New York: Lexington Books.

Cohen, R.I. (1995). Probation and parole violators in state prison, 1991, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Ditton, P.M. & Wilson, D.J. (1999). Truth-in-sentencing in state prisons. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics (NCJ 170032).

English, K. (1998). Containment approach: an aggressive strategy for the community management of adult sex offenders. Psychology, Public Policy, and Law. 4(1/2), 218-235.

Fulton, B., Stichman, A., Travis, L., & Latessa, L. (1997). Moderating probation and parole officer attitudes to achieve desired outcomes. The Prison Journal, 77(3), 295-312.

Glaser, D. (1964). The effectiveness of a prison and parole system. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company.

Glaze, L.E. (2003). Probation and parole in the United States, 2002. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics (NCJ 201135).

Hughes, T.A., Wilson, D.J., & Beck, A.J. (2001). Trends in state parole, 1990-2000. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics (NCJ 184735).

Johnson, K. (2002). States use of GPS offender tracking systems. Journal of Offender Monitoring, 15(2), 21-22, to 26.

Langan, P.A. & Levin, D.J. (2002). Recidivism of prisoners released in 1994. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics (NCJ 193427).

Leitenberger, D., Semenyna, P. & Spelman, J.B. (2003). Community corrections and community policing: a perfect match. FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin. 72(11), 20-23.

O'Leary, V. & Clear, T.R. (1984). Directions for community correcitons in the 1990s. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections.

Petersilia, J.R. (2000). When prisoners return to the community: Political, economic, and social consequences. Sentencing and Corrections: Issues for the 21st Century. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Rhine, E.E. (1997). Probation and parole supervision: In need of a new narrative. Corrections Quarterly, 1(2), 71-75.

Rothman, D.I. (1980). Conscience and convenience: The asylum and its alternatives in progressive America. Boston, MA: Little Brown.

Studt, E. (1972). Surveillance and Service in Parole: A Report of the Parole Action Study. Los Angeles, CA: University of California.

Table 1: Respondent and Job Characteristics

Respondent Characteristics (N = 142)

Variable	% *	(n)
Sex		
Male	46%	(65)
Female	54%	(75)
Race		
White, NH	80%	(110)
Black, NH	17%	(23)
Hispanic/ Other	4%	(5)
Age		
Mean = 34.5 years; Median = 32 years		
Education Level		
< college graduate	3%	(4)
college graduate	59%	(83)
some grad school	21%	(30)
graduate degree	16%	(23)
Major		
Criminal Justice	50%	(69)
Psychology	16%	(22)
"Other" major	14%	(20)
Soc./ social work	13%	(18)
All others	8%	(10)

Job Characteristics

Variable	%*	(n)
Time on Job		
Mean = 66 months; Median = 38.5 months		
Number of Offenders Supervised		
Mean = 65.8; Median = 65		
Caseload Type		
Regular	48%	(68)
Specialized	51%	(72)
Mix	1%	(2)

* Percentages of all cases with known information; denominator includes missing cases

Table 2: Average Time Spent in Supervisory Activities

Activity	Average % of Time Spent*
Home Visits	8 %
Work Visits	1 %
Office Assessments	11 %
Office Counseling	15 %
Office Drug Tests	6 %
Explaining Rules	8 %
Writing Violations	13 %
Court Appearances	7 %
Directing to Programs	8 %
Recommending Early Discharge	1 %
Detention Interviews	4 %
Offender Groups	1 %
Follow-up Participation	5 %
Significant Others	3 %
Victims	2 %
Other Activities 1**	9 %
Other Activities 2 **	5 %

Activities by Type	Average % of Time Spent***
Casework Activities:	54 %
Surveillance Activities:	42 %
"Other" Activities:	26 % (median = 15%)

* Does not total 100% because of rounding

** Includes activities such as writing case summary reports, attending meetings, record checks, etc.

*** Totals more than 100% because of multiple responses

Table 3: Ranking on Supervision Styles Continuum

Self-Ranking:	%	(n)	Peer-Ranking:	%	(n)
1	0	(0)	1	0	(0)
2	1.4%	(2)	2	2.8%	(4)
3	8.5%	(12)	3	5.6%	(8)
4	15.5%	(22)	4	14.8%	(21)
5	21.1%	(30)	5	27.5%	(39)
6	15.5%	(22)	6	16.2%	(23)
7	21.8%	(31)	7	15.5%	(22)
8	9.9%	(14)	8	14.1%	(20)
9	3.5%	(5)	9	2.1%	(3)
10	2.8%	(4)	10	1.4%	(2)

Table 4: Bivariate Correlations

		Time in **Surveillance**	Time in **Casework**	Caseload **Type**	Self- **Ranking**	Peer- **Ranking**	**Age**	**Sex**	Time **On Job**
Caseload	Pearsoncorr.	-.104	-.279**	-.366**	.149	.142	.066	-.189*	-.156
	Sig. (2 tailed)	.217	.001	.000	.077 .	.092	.449	.025	.064
	N	142	142	140	142	142	135	140	142
Time On Job	Pearsoncorr.	-.162	.042	.219**	.019	-.059	.460**	.023	
	Sig. (2 tailed)	.055	.618	.009	.819	.487	.000	.784	
	N	142	142	140	142	142	135	140	
Sex	Pearson corr.	-.045	.222**	.070	-.105	.001	-.253**		
	Sig. (2 tailed)	.597	.008	.413	.219	.990	.003		
	N	140	140	138	140	140	135		
Age	Pearson corr.	-.116	-.132	.118	-.048	.013			
	Sig. (2 tailed)	.181	.128	.177	.582	.882			
	N	135	135	133	135	135			
Peer-Ranking	Pearsoncorr.	-.057	.053	.043	.298**				
	Sig. (2 tailed)	.503	.532	.612	.000				
	N	142	142	140	142				
Self-Ranking	Pearson corr.	.054	-.176*	.056					
	Sig. (2 tailed)	.527	.037	.514					
	N	142	142	140					
Caseload Type	Pearson corr.	-.189*	.029						
	Sig. (2 tailed)	.025	.729						
	N	140	140						
Time In Casework.	Pearson corr.	-.513**							
	Sig. (2 tailed)	.000							
	N	142							

* p </= .05
** p </= .01

Table 5: T-Tests for Independent Samples: Differences in Time Spent by Caseload Type

Variable	Caseload Type	N	Mean	SD	SE	
Time Spent: Casework	Regular	68	53.09	11.79	1.43	t(138) = -.347, p = .729
	Specialized	72	53.94	16.53	1.95	
Time Spent: Surveillance	Regular	68	44.53	11.47	1.39	t(138) = 2.27, p = .025*
	Specialized	72	39.69	13.66	1.61	

* $p < .05$

Table 6: T-Tests for Independent Samples: Differences in Time Spent in Casework Activities by Sex and Continuum Self-Rankings

Variable	Sex	N	Mean	SD	SE	
Time Spent In Casework	Male	65	50.37	16.11	2.00	t(138) = - 2.67, p = .008**
	Female	75	56.70	11.86	1.37	

Variable	Self-Ranking	N	Mean	SD	SE	
Time Spent In Casework	Casework-Oriented	66	56.28	12.58	1.55	t(140) = 2.11, p = .037*
	Surveillance-Oriented	76	51.27	15.33	1.76	

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

Table 7: One-Way ANOVA and Tukey HSD: Differences in Time Spent in Casework and Surveillance Activities by Self-Ranking

Variable	Self-Ranking	N	Mean	SD	SE	
Time Spent In Casework	2	2	54.00	26.87	19.00	F (8,133,141) = 3.144, p = .003**
	3	12	60.58	11.52	3.33	
	4	22	57.09	7.61	1.62	
	5	30	54.12	14.97	2.73	
	6	22	53.68	13.60	2.90	
	7	31	53.54	12.31	2.21	
	8	14	49.18	13.50	3.61	
	9	5	54.00	20.78	9.30	
	10	4	24.25	24.46	12.23	

** p < .01

Variable	Self-Ranking	N	Mean	SD	SE	
Time Spent In Surveillance	2	2	46.00	26.87	19.00	F (8,133,141) = .778, p = .623
	3	12	37.17	12.08	3.49	
	4	22	41.95	7.97	1.70	
	5	30	42.17	12.84	2.34	
	6	22	43.68	12.37	2.64	
	7	31	42.49	9.35	1.68	
	8	14	45.11	12.97	3.47	
	9	5	42.00	27.78	12.43	
	10	4	30.75	27.90	13.95	

Tukey HSD Test: Location of Differences In Time Spent on Casework By Self-Ranking

	m_2	m_3	m_4	m_5	m_6	m_7	m_8	m_9
m_3	-6.58							
m_4	-3.09	3.49						
m_5	-.117	6.47	2.97					
m_6	.318	6.90	3.41	.435				
m_7	.460	7.04	3.55	.576	.142			
m_8	4.82	11.40	7.91	4.94	4.50	4.36		
m_9	.000	6.58	3.09	.117	-.318	-.460	-4.82	
m_{10}	29.75	36.33**	32.84**	29.87**	29.43**	29.29**	24.93*	29.75*

* p < .05
** p < .01

Table 8: Jonckheere-Terpstra Test: Differences Among Self-Rankings by Caseload, Time Spent on Casework Activities, and Time Spent on Surveillance Activities

Variable	N	J-T Statistic	Sig. (2-tailed)
Time on Job	142	1.440	.150
Caseload	142	1.844	.065
Time Spent In Casework	142	-2.749	.006**
Time Spent In Surveillance	142	.969	.332

** $p < .01$

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW REGARDING ROLES AND FUNCTIONS
OF PROBATION AND PAROLE OFFICERS

All State probation and parole officers in the (specify P & P office) were asked to complete a short survey to indicate how much of their time they spent on different tasks and activities. The surveys also included the length of service of officers for the State of (specify state). From those who completed the survey and indicated a willingness to be further interviewed, we randomly selected a group of twenty-five officers, who equally represent the various lengths of service. We ask that you respond to the questions asked by the interviewer. As with the survey, your participation is completely voluntary. We would like to audio tape this interview, to make it easier for the interviewer to develop their notes and accurately record your responses. You will not be identified by name or any other identification other than as primarily a probation or parole officer with a range of length of service.

Interview Code #_____

1. What is your principle job? Check the one which applies.
   _____ Full-time probation officer
   _____ Full-time parole officer
   _____ Combined probation and parole functions
   If combined, percent of time spent on each of the two functions
   _____ Percent of your time spent on parole
   _____ Percent of your time spent on probation
   _____ Percent of your time spent on some other than probation or parole functions (Specify_____)
   __100%_ TOTAL

2. What type of caseload do you supervise?
   _____ Normal
   _____ Specialized – If a special caseload, please list the type _____

3. What is the typical number of offenders you supervise at any one time? _____

4. How long have you been in a position as a probation or parole officer with the State of Missouri?

5. Describe what do you consider the primary role of a probation or parole officer?

6. Do you think it is more important for a probation or parole officer to concentrate on what is referred to as the "casework" style of supervision, or on the "surveillance" style of supervision? Why?

7. What are the most important "casework" functions carried out by officers?

8. What are the most important "surveillance" functions carried out by officers?

9. How do you determine which style of supervision to follow? For instance, is it dictated from upper management, result from the type of offenders you supervise, increase in the size of caseloads, or does each officer develop his or her own style?

10. Do you think that the supervision style of officers directly impacts recidivism rates? How?

11. Do you think that the supervision style of officers directly impacts revocation rates? How?

12. Do you think that the supervision style of officers directly impacts stress and burn-out of officers? How?

13. What other factors do you think are directly impacted by the officer's style of supervision and in what way?

14. What do you consider as the greatest challenges facing the recruitment and retention of talented and dedicated officers?

15. Do you envision any dramatic changes in the way offenders are supervised on probation or parole over the next ten years. If so, what are they?

16. Many people suggest that supervision styles of parole and probation officer fall into either a "casework" or a "surveillance" approach. A casework style of supervision is said to place emphasis on assisting the offender with problems, counseling, and working to make sure the offender successfully completes supervision. A surveillance style of supervision is said to place an emphasis on monitoring and enforcing compliance with the rules or supervision and the detection of violations leading to revocation and return to custody.

    Please circle the appropriate number on the following casework-surveillance continuum that best represents where you see your personal supervision style.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Casework									Surveillance

Please circle the appropriate number on the following casework-surveillance continuum that best represents where you see the supervision style of your peers.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Casework									Surveillance

17. What specific prisoner reentry (return to the community from prison) programs are you aware of and you use? Which do you think are the most effective and why?

18. What two or three things can be done to improve prisoner reentry, and specifically reduce the level of parole revocations in your state?